

### REMARKS

In reviewing the specification as filed for responding to this Office Action, it became obvious that a typographical error exists in Paragraph [0058], where Figures 11a through 11d are referred to as Figures 7a through 7d. Figure 7 is a singular figure. This error is corrected above and a clean copy of Paragraph [0058] is appended hereto.

In the restriction requirement, the Examiner has stated that the application contains eight patentably distinct species, as follows:

Species I	Figure 1
Species II	Figure 7
Species III	Figure 8
Species IV	Figure 10
Species V	Figure 11a
Species VI	Figure 11b
Species VII	Figure 11c
Species VIII	Figure 11d.

The Examiner has further required that the applicant elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims will be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

The applicant does not traverse the Examiner's determination that the species set forth above are patentably distinct one from the other.

However, the applicant asserts that the Examiner has incorrectly determined the number of species present, since Figure 9 sets out another patentably distinct species. Also, the variations on tubular portion 10 set out in Figures 11a through 11d are really subspecies, since each can be used with the devices shown in Figures 1 and 7-10, as stated in the specification at Paragraph [0057]. Further, no claims are actually directed at the different embodiments shown in what applicant designates as the subspecies. For that reason, the applicant asserts that the species should be as follows:

#### Claims:

Species A	Figure 1	1-7, 9, 10, 11-40, 54
Species B	Figure 7	1-8, 9, 11-46, 47-53, 54, 55, 58
Species C	Figure 8	1-8, 9, 11-46, 47-53, 54, 55, 58

Species D      Figure 9      1-8, 9, 11-46, 47-53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58  
Species E      Figure 10      1-8, 9, 11-46

Subspecies a   Figure 11a  
Subspecies b   Figure 11b  
Subspecies c   Figure 11c  
Subspecies d   Figure 11d.

Generic claims are present

The applicant respectfully submits that all claims depend ultimately from claim 1, so claim 1 is generic. Further, claims 2 through 9 and 11 through 40 are also generic. The applicant submits that the Examiner is incorrect in asserting that no claims are generic.


Election of Species

The applicant further elects to prosecute the species of **Figure 9**. It is believed that claims 1-8, 9, 11-46, 47-53, 54, 55, 56, 57 and 58 all read upon this species.

In view of the foregoing arguments and claim amendments, the applicant submits that the claims pending in this case are presently in a condition for examination and allowance. Therefore, the applicant requests early and favorable disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP  
1225 W. Market St.  
Akron, OH 44313  
330-864-5550  
Fax 330-864-7986  
Customer No. 021324  
[slgrant@hahnlaw.com](mailto:slgrant@hahnlaw.com)

  
Stephen L. Grant  
Reg. No. 33,390